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FOOD EXPENDITURES IN 1960-61 I/
Publication of additional results of the 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures for the total United States now allows detailed analysis of expenditure patterns by families for 1960-61. 2/ Previously, summary data for the United States and data from the urban, rüral nonfarm, and farm segments were available. In addition, family expenditure data were published for the 4 major regions: Northeast, North Central, South, and West.

Consumer expenditure studies in the past have been conducted about once every decade. The primary purpose of these surveys is to provide a basis for updating index weights used in computation of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. BLS used the results of the 1960-61 survey of urban families in making the CPI revision published beginning January 1964. 3/ In addition, the survey provides a comprehensive study of factors influencing family expenditure patterns for the entire U. S. population. The U. S. Department of Agriculture cooperated in the survey and published all the rural farm survey reports. The 1960-61 survey provided the first cross-sectional data for the entire United States since 1941-42. It supplements annual consumer expenditure data from the National Income Accounts, U. S. Department of Commerce, by providing detailed information by income, family size, and other socio-economic characteristics.

Food Expenditures and Income
Total income after taxes in 1960-61 averaged $\$ 6,072$ per family in the United States, or $\$ 1,898$ per capita, according to data derived from the Survey of Consumer Expenditures. 4/ The average size of family (consumer unit) was 3.2 persons, including singIe individuals. The total value of food averaged $\$ 1,293$ per family or $\$ 404$ per capita. This total, herein termed food expenditures, includes $\$ 989$ spend for food prepared at home, $\$ 246$ spent for meals

[^0]away from home, $\$ 15$ worth of food received without expense, and $\$ 44$ worth of home-produced food. On this basis, 21.3 percent of income went for food in 1960-61. 5/

Families in higher income brackets spent more for food than those in the lower brackets. Part of the difference was due to larger families among highincome groups--families with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or more averaged 4 persons compared with only 2 persons for families with less than $\$ 3,000$ income. Food expenditures increased with income on a per capita basis too, but not as strongly. Comparing families in different income groups, a l-percent increase in per capita income after taxes was associated with a 0.4 -percent increase in per capita food expenditures (table 14). 6/ As a result, the percentage of income spent for food declined as family income increased--families with incomes below $\$ 3,000$ used about a third of their income for food whereas families receiving $\$ 10,000$ income or more spent only a sixth for food.

Families in successively higher income brackets reacted differently to alternative methods of obtaining food. On the average, however, l-percent increase in per capita income after taxes was associated with a 0.9 -percent increase in per capita spending for food away from home, but only a 0.4 -percent increase for food purchased for use at home. A l-percent increase in income led to a decline of 0.9 percent in the sum of the value of food received without expense and home-produced food. This decline was strongly influenced by farm families who accounted for most of the home-produced food and who had lower average incomes.

Food Expenditures Related
to Family Size
Although total food expenditures and total family income both generally increased with family size, per capita income declined from $\$ 2,964$ per capita for single individuals to $\$ 1,017$ per capita for families of 6 or more persons (table 14). The percentage of income spent for food was greater for large families than for small families. But even so, food expenditures dropped from $\$ 607$ for single individuals to $\$ 270$ per capita for families of 6 or more.

[^1]Table 14.--Food expenditures and income, by family size, urbanization, and region


[^2]
## FOOD SPENDING RELATED TO INCOME *

PER CAPITA FOOD EXPENDITURES


PER CAPITA INCOME AFTER TAXES $\triangle$
*all families and single consumers. united states.
AIHCLUDES NONMONEY INCOME. DATAFROM 1960.61 SURVEY OF CONSUMER EXPENDITURES, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.

Single individuals spent more than 3 times as much for meals purchased away from home as the average for each person in families of 2 or more persons and more than twice as much as each member of 2 -person families. Single individuals spent more than a third of their total food expenditures for away from home eating, whereas families of 2 or more persons devoted an average of less than a fifth of their food spending to purchased meals.

Each family size group received about the same amount of food without expense or home-produced, on a per capita basis. The 6-or-more person family group was the only one to account for more than 5 percent of total food in this way.

Large families on the average tended to spend about the same share of increases in income per capita for food over income levels. But the pattern of spending differed. For each l-percent increase in income, persons in 6 or more person families spent 0.6 percent more for food at home compared with only 0.3 percent increase for single consumers and 0.4 percent increase for persons in 2-person families. The opposite tendency was shown for purchases of food away from home. A l-percent increase in income for persons in families of 2 or 3 persons was associated with more than a l-percent increase in spending for food away from home compared with 0.8 or 0.9 percent for persons in the larger family groups.

## Food Expenditures

By Urbanization
Urban families spent about a fourth more per person for food--including the value of home-produced food and that received without expense--than did families living on farms or in rural nonfarm areas. The retail value of homeproduced food amounted to about a third of the total food used by farm families. Rural nonfarm families also depended upon home-produced food for a much greater part of total food than did urban families, and they received more food without expense than did either farm or urban families. Urban families received half again as much income after taxes as did farm families and about 40 percent more than rural nonfarm families. Despite greater food expenditures by urban families, the percentage of income going for food was less--2l percent for urban compared with 22 percent for rural nonfarm and 26 percent for farm families.

At successively higher income levels, farm families spent less of a dollar's increase in income for food than did urban and rural nonfarm families, only 0.1 percent for farm compared with 0.4 percent for urban and rural nonfarm families. Several reasons help account for this difference: Home-produced food had an inverse association with rising income levels so the large proportion of food home produced by farm families reduced the association with income for total food. 7/ Also, the greater variability of income by farm families undoubtedly plays a significant role in moderating the spending habits of farm

[^3]families in years when income is high. Further, the much lower spending on food away from home associated with a dollar's increase in income probably is related to the convenience of eating lunch at home and the travel necessary in buying other food away from home by farm families.

Food Expenditures
By Region
Families in the Northeast spent more per capita for food than did families living in other areas. Southern families spent about a third less per capita than families in the Northeast, but incomes in the South where urbanization is less intense were proportionately less as well. As a result, differences among regions in percentage of income spent for food were relatively small. Differences in food expenditures among regions may be due to differing price levels, food preferences, or quantity consumed. Families in the south led in value of home-produced food consumed with 8 percent of the total. Food away from home varied among regions from 18 to 21 percent of total food, with the West at the top of the range.

At successively higher income levels, Southern families tended to spend more per capita for food, particularly for food at home, than did families in other regions (table 15). Also, Southern families showed less of a decline in per capita value of home-produced food and food received without expense at higher income levels than did families in other regions. These variations appear related to the lower average incomes and food expenditures in the South.

## Breakdown of Nonfarm Food Dollar by Commodity 8/

Although quantity data are not available from the 1960-61 survey, detailed expenditure data, covering food expenditures by commodity for food purchased and prepared at home in a week during the first halves of 1961 and 1962 were published by a private organization for nonfarm housekeeping families (fig. 8 and table 15). 9/ The breakdown of the dollar spent for food prepared at home by nonfarm families is quite similar, although not identical, to the commodity weights used in combining prices in the CPI. IO/ The breakdown can also be

8/ Also, see "How Families Spend Their Food Dollars," by Betty Peterkin and Faīth Clark, Family Economic Review, March 1966, ARS 62-5, pp. 3-6, and "Food Expenditures of Urban Families, 1950 to 1960-61, " by Laura Mae Webb, Monchly Labor Review, Vol. 88, No. 8 (February 1965), pp. 150-53 (reprinted as BIS Report No. 238-9, May 1965).

9/ Bureau of Labor Statistics data for nonfarm families obtained for the week preceding the interview for the 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures were published by National Industrial Conference Board in Expenditure Patterns of the American Family (New York: 845 Third Ave.), 1965,175 pages.

10/ "Consumer Price Index Revision, " National Food Situation, NFS-I08 (May 1964), table 8, page 19, gives index weights for 14 food groups in the CPI.

Table 15.--Per capita income and food expenditures of nonfarm families and single consumers, by family income, family size, and region, 1960-61 l/

| Item |  | U. S. average |  | Family money income (before taxes) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Cents per food dollar | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 3,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,000- \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5,000- \\ 7,499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 7,500- \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \$ 10,000- \\ & : \quad 14,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 15,000$ <br> and over |
| Family size 2/ | : |  | 3.2 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
|  | : | Cents | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. |
| Money income after taxes | : | --- | 1,761 | 836 | 1,349 | 1,709 | 2,194 | 2,930 | 5,774 |
| Total income after taxes 3/4/ | : | --- | 1,916 | 1,005 | 1,518 | 1,864 | 2,329 | 3,057 | 5,963 |
| Food expenditures 4/ 5/ | : | --- | 404 | 299 | 363 | 398 | 464 | 541 | 740 |
| At home | : | --- | 315 | 233 | 288 | 321 | 358 | 396 | 495 |
| Away from home | : | --- | 79 | 43 | 64 | 70 | 100 | 138 | 239 |
| Received without expense 5/ |  | --- | 10 | 24 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| Average weekly food expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (at home) 6/ |  | 100.0 | 6.62 | 5.41 | 6.08 | $6.61$ | 7.14 | 7.53 | 8.27 |
| Cereal products | : | 4.6 | . 30 | . 35 |  |  |  |  | . 24 |
| Bakery products: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bread | : | 4.0 | . 27 | . 24 | . 26 | . 27 | . 28 | . 27 | . 26 |
| Other | : | 4.9 | . 32 | . 21 | . 28 | . 32 | . 36 | . 40 | . 46 |
| Meat, poultry, and fish: Meat - total | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 25.4 | 1.68 | 1.24 | 1.51 | 1.69 | 1.84 | 2.01 | 2.25 |
| Beef, fresh and frozen | : | 11.0 | . 73 | . 44 | . 59 | . 72 | . 81 | . 96 | 1.17 |
| Pork, fresh and frozen | : | 4.0 | . 26 | . 22 | . 26 | . 27 | . 28 | . 28 | . 24 |
| Bacon and ham 7/ | : | 3.5 | . 23 | . 19 | . 22 | . 23 | . 25 | . 26 | . 25 |
| Other meat 8/ | : | 6.9 | . 46 | . 39 | . 43 | . 47 | . 50 | . 51 | . 58 |
| Poultry, fresh and frozen | : | 4.0 | . 27 | . 27 | . 26 | . 25 | . 27 | . 28 | . 32 |
| Fish and shellfish | : | 2.5 | . 17 | . 11 | . 14 | . 16 | . 19 | . 21 | . 31 |
| Milk, cream, and cheese | : | 14.5 | . 96 | . 75 | . 87 | . 99 | 1.04 | 1.08 | 1.18 |
| Fluid milk and cream | : | 9.3 | . 61 | .43 | . 55 | . 63 | . 68 | . 70 | . 77 |
| Cheese | : | 2.2 | . 14 | . 12 | . 12 | . 15 | . 15 | . 18 | . 21 |
| Ice cream and frozen dessert | : | 1.8 | . 12 | . 07 | . 10 | . 13 | . 14 | . 15 | . 16 |
| Other | : | 1.2 | . 08 | . 11 | . 10 | . 08 | . 06 | . 06 | . 05 |
| Eggs | : | 3.6 | . 24 | . 25 | . 25 | . 24 | . 24 | . 24 | . 26 |
| Fats and oils - total | : | 4.5 | . 30 | . 28 | . 29 | . 30 | . 31 | . 31 | . 31 |
| Butter | : | 1.4 | . 09 | . 06 | . 07 | . 09 | . 10 | . 12 | . 13 |
| Margarine | : | . 9 | . 06 | . 06 | . 06 | . 06 | . 06 | . 05 | . 05 |
| Lard | : | . 2 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 01 | . 01 | . 01 | $2 /$ |
| Other 10/ | : | 2.0 | . 13 | . 11 | . 11 | . 13 | . 14 | . 14 | . 14 |
| Fruits and vegetables: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fruits - total | : | 7.9 | . 53 | . 40 | . 43 | . 50 | . 59 | .67 | . 78 |
| Fresh | : | 3.8 | . 25 | . 20 | . 22 | . 23 | . 29 | . 31 | . 37 |
| Canned, including juice | : | 2.5 | . 17 | . 14 | . 14 | . 15 | . 18 | . 19 | . 22 |
| Frozen, including juice 11/ | : | 1.6 | . 09 | . 04 | . 07 | . 09 | . 12 | . 15 | . 16 |
| Dried | : | . 3 | . 02 | . 02 | . 01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 |
| Vegetables - totar | : | 7.2 | . 48 | . 38 | . 42 | . 46 | . 53 | . 57 | . 64 |
| Fresh | : | 3.7 | . 25 | . 19 | . 21 | . 23 | . 28 | . 30 | . 36 |
| Canned, including juice | : | 2.1 | . 14 | . 12 | . 13 | . 14 | . 15 | . 15 | . 14 |
| Frozen | : | . 9 | . 06 | . 03 | . 05 | . 05 | . 07 | . 09 | . 11 |
| Dried 12/ | : | . 5 | . 03 | . 04 | . 04 | . 04 | . 03 | . 03 | . 03 |
| Potatoes - total | : | 2.0 | . 13 | . 10 | . 13 | . 15 | . 15 | . 14 | . 13 |
| Fresh | : | 1.2 | . 08 | . 08 | . 09 | . 09 | . 08 | . 08 | . 08 |
| Processed | : | . 8 | . 05 | . 03 | . 05 | . 06 | . 06 | . 06 | . 06 |
| Sugar and sweets | : | 3.5 | . 23 | . 21 | . 24 | . 23 | . 24 | . 24 | . 23 |
| Beverages | : | 5.5 | . 36 | . 35 | . 34 | . 36 | . 38 | . 38 | . 43 |
| Baby foods | : | . 8 | . 05 | . 02 | . 05 | . 07 | . 05 | . 05 | . 10 |
| Soup | : | 1.3 | . 09 | . 07 | . 08 | .09 | . 09 | . 10 | . 10 |
| Other food: | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepared dishes | : | 2.0 1.7 | . 13 | . 08 | . 11 | .13 .11 | .15 .12 | . 16 | . 213 |
| Other | : | 1.7 | . 11 | . 09 | . 10 | . 11 | . 12 | . 13 | . 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 15.--Per capita income and food expenditures of nonfarm families and single consumers, by family income, family size, and region, 1960-61 I/ -Continued
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compared with an analysis of grocery store sales by commodity from a survey conducted annually by Food Topics, and with food sales by merchandise line reported in the 1963 Census of Business. 11/

All of these data sources indicate that around a fourth of the housewife's weekly food budget typically goes for meat or upwards of a third if poultry and fish are included. Fruits and vegetables make up another fifth of the total if potatoes, soups, and baby foods are included. Grocery store sales figures show a little larger proportion, nearly a fourth of food sales, for this group. Dairy products and cereal and bakery products each accounted for a sixth or seventh of the total. A breakdown of sales by grocery stores naturally shows less for dairy products-about a tenth of the total--since they often are home delivered or purchased at dairy stores.

Comparison With

## 1955 Survey

Comparison of data from the 1960-61 Survey with the 1955 Household Food Consumption Survey shows relatively minor changes in the overall food expenditure pattern. Per capita expenditures for food at home in a week in spring 1955 by nonfarm families totaled $\$ 6.92$ compared with $\$ 6.62$ in 1961-62.

The percentage of the food budget going for meat was about unchanged: More was spent for the major fresh and frozen beef cuts; the same proportion was spent for fresh and frozen pork, but less was allotted for bacon and ham (including canned); spending on cold cuts and frankfurters was up. The data available in the two surveys for the remaining meat items could not be precisely matched. Expenditures for fresh and frozen poultry meat dropped from 5 to 4 percent of the total, apparently because of reduced prices. Fish and seafood retained its position at $21 / 2$ percent of the food budget.

Fresh fruits and vegetables dropped from 10 percent of the budget to 7 I/2 percent. Some of this change may be attributed to seasonal differences since the time periods of the surveys were not the same. Processed vegetables was unchanged at $31 / 2$ percent, but that for processed fruits increased from 3 to 4 percent. The proportion used for processed fruit in 1955 was slightly less than for processed vegetables. Potatoes showed no change since the decreased proportion going for fresh potatoes was completely offset by processed items.

Relatively large declines were recorded in the budget for dairy products and beverages (excluding alcohol). Sugars and sweets and baby and junior foods both showed a minute increase and eggs a slight decline in the proportion of the food budget. Declines took place for animal fats, but increases for vegetable oils. Generally the 1961-62 survey showed that a larger share of the food budget was going for processed products and less for fresh products.

11/ Data from both of these sources are tabulated in "Food and Beverage Sales By the Retail Trade," National Food Situation, NFS-114 (November 1965). pp. 24-29. (Reprinted as ERS-268).

These changes in allocation of the food budget do not necessarily show changes in consumption patterns; price changes may be equally or more responsible for the change in expenditure patterns. Between 1955 and 1961-62, there were retail price declines for poultry, beverages, and eggs and increases less than that for 211 foods at home for pork and sugar and sweeteners. Price increases exceeding that for all food occurred for total meat (especially beef and veal), dairy products, fresh fruits and vegetables, and cereal and bakery products.

Spending Pattern by
Level of Income
For most foods, per capita expenditures increase at successively higher income levels, but this pattern is not universal. Foods for which expenditures per person increased markedly at higher income levels included bakery products; meats (especially beef); fish and seafood; milk products; fresh, canned, and frozen fruits; and fresh and frozen vegetables. No doubt part of the expenditure increases resulted from increased quantities purchased, but higher prices probably were paid by families in higher income groups. But, generally, these are the groups of foods that have experienced strong demands.

Among items or groups of foods for which expenditures per person did not increase noticeably at higher income levels, or even declined, were poultry, canned fruit juice, canned vegetables and juice, dried fruits and vegetables, fresh and frozen potato products, sugar and sweets, beverages (except soft drinks), eggs, fats and oils, and cereal products. Since higher prices probably were paid by higher income families for these foods too, decreased expenditures by level of income probably indicate decreased consumption.

These trends within commodity groups obviously altered the proportions of the food dollar spent by income level. Families at higher income levels spent proportionately more for beef and fish but less for poultry. The proportion spent for bakery products remained at a constant 9 percent across the income scale, but that for cereals declined from 5 percent at lower incomes to 3 percent in the $\$ 15,000$-and-over income level.

Increased proportions of total spending at higher income levels went for total processed fruit but processed vegetables accounted for around $31 / 2$ percent of the food budget for all income levels. The pattern of spending for fresh fruits and fresh vegetables was almost identical, going from 3.5 percent to 4.4 percent of the total at the highest income level. The proportion spent for potatoes remained constant over the income range, with slightly decreasina expenditures for fresh potatoes about offset by increased purchases of chips and frozen potato products at higher income levels.

The proportion of food budget allocated to sugar and sweets, beverages, eggs, and fats and oils declined at succeedingly higher income levels. These are items for which expenditures per person were about equal over the income range; the only factor affecting proportion spent was the increasing size of the total food budget.

## Spending Pattern

By Region
Families in the Northeast spent more per person than the U.S. average for each of the major food groups; in the South they spent less; and in the North Central region the same or less. Families in the West spent slightly less than average for meat, poultry, potatoes, and beverages and more for each other major food group except bakery products and fats and oils. Northeastern families spent a greater percentage of their food budget for bakery products, meat, and fish than in any other region; North Central families allocated the most to dairy products and potatoes; the South the most to cereal products, sugar and sweets, beverages, eggs, and fats and oils; and the West rated fruits and vegetables a relatively higher position in the budget than any other region.

Spending Pattern By
Size of Family
There were no major food groups for which expenditures per capita were larger for large families than for small families, probably because total food expenditures per capita declined significantly with family size. Part of the reason probably was due also to the economy of scale of feeding more people. With lower incomes per capita, large families likely bought less expensive cuts -of meats and other foods. Relative to small families, large families were found to spend less of their food budget for meat, poultry, and fish; fruits and vegetables, and beverages, and to spend more for dairy products, cereal and bakery products, and sugar and sweets.


[^0]:    1/ By Stephen J. Hiemstra and Helen M. Ekiund, Food Consumption Section, Ecōnomic Research Service.

    2/ U. S. Department of Labor, Consumer Expenditures and Income--Detail of Expenditure and Income. Total United States, Urban and Rural, Survey of Consumer Expenditures, 1960-61, Supplement 3-Part A to BLS Report No. 237-93 (USDA Report CES 45), May 1966.
    3/ "Consumer Price Index Revision," National Food Situation, NFS-108 (May 1964), pp. 18-24.
    4) Derived by ERS as the total of consumer expenditures (including personal insurance and gifts and contributions), net savings (net change in assets and liabilities), the value of items received without expense, and the value of home-produced food. This definition of income is numerically equal to money income after taxes of $\$ 1,737$ per capita plus nonmoney income (items received without expense and home-produced food), other money receipts, and "account balancing difference." It compares with disposable personal income of $\$ 1,960$ per capita for 1960-61 reported in the Kational Income Accounts. Although the definition of income used in this report differs in certain respects from that used in the National Income Accounts, it is much closer than use of money income after taxes often used in analysis of survey results.

[^1]:    5 Food expenditures averaged $\$ 390$ per capita in 1960-61 according to the National Income Accounts, or 19.9 percent of disposable personal income.

    6/ This gross relationship between per capita food expenditures and income over 10 income groups obscures changes that occurred in average prices paid per unit, product mix of the food market basket, and forms and places in which food was purchased in addition to changes in total quantities purchased. Since this comparison was made among families in different income groups at a given point in time, behavior of the same families may differ as income increases over time.

[^2]:    l/ Total of consumer expenditures (including personal insurance and gifts and contributions), net savings (net change in
    assets and liabilities), the value of items received without expense, and the value of home-produced food. assets and liabilities), the value of items received without expense, and the value of home-produced food.
    $\overline{3} /$ Compares with 19.9 percent of disposable personal income spent for food in 1960-61 based on National Income Accounts,
    observations. Data deprived from Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures.

[^3]:    7/ The slightly negative relation between income and value of home-produced food plus food received without expense is influenced strongly by a small value of home-produced food by the $\$ 15,000$-and-over income group.

